

**REMARKS**

Applicant requests reconsideration and allowance of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Claims 1-15 are pending in the present application. Claims 1, 4, 7, and 11 are the independent claims.

Claims 1-5 and 7-13 have been amended. No new matter is believed to have been added.

**Substance of Interview**

Applicant acknowledges with appreciation the courtesies extended to Applicant's undersigned representative during the personal interview conducted on March 19, 2007. During that interview, the claims and cited art were discussed and contrasted. It was agreed that various additions of "one of" and "or" to the claims consistent with the claim amendments made in the present Amendment, the various "setting" features define over the primary citation to King et al. It was also agreed that Yamakawa et al. does not remedy this deficiency. Further, it was agreed that the teachings of Yamakawa et al. differ so much from King et al. that one of ordinary skill in the art would not be motivated to make the asserted combination. Lastly, the various allegations in the Office Action of imprecision in the claims were discussed and it was explained to Applicant's representative that the allegations were not presented as rejections under the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. § 112 because they would each be new ground of rejection that would preclude finality.

**Traversal**

Claims 1-15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 5,644,325 (King et al.) in view of U.S. Patent 5,809,366 (Yamakawa et al.). All rejections are respectfully traversed.

Independent claims 1, 4, 7, and 11 have been amended to further variously define how a region is set. It was agreed for the reasons discussed during the personal interview that such amendments patentably define over King et al.

The secondary citation to Yamanaka et al. does not remedy the aforementioned deficiency for at least two reasons. Firstly, Yamanaka et al. does not detect any pixel level of a

selected component of an RGB signal. Secondly, Yamanaka et al. relates to calibrating a color copier, not signal processing. Thus, one of ordinary skill in the art would not be motivated to make the asserted combination.

Accordingly, favorable reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of independent claims 1, 4, 7, and 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 are respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that the independent claims patentably define the present invention over the citations of record. Further, the dependent claims should also be allowable for the same reasons as their respective base claims and further due to the additional features that they recite. Separate and individual consideration of the dependent claims is respectfully requested.

Lastly, regarding the several numbered and unnumbered allegations made in the Response to Arguments section of the Office Action, Applicant submits that the same have been addressed by amendment. It is submitted that the claims, as presently amended, now even more fully satisfy the requirements of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. § 112. Further, in the event that the Office makes any rejection under the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. § 112 as indefinite, Applicant respectfully requests that the Office specifically articulate a prima facie case as to why one of ordinary skill in the art would not understand what is claimed.

Applicant believes that the present Amendment is responsive to each of the points raised by the Examiner in the Official Action. However, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to such matters.

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 4-17-07

By: Michael E. Kondoudis  
Michael E. Kondoudis  
Registration No. 42,758

1201 New York Avenue, NW, 7th Floor  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Telephone: (202) 434-1500  
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501